



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,630	11/12/2003	Marguerite B. McDonald	55915-79433	7979
44777	7590	03/10/2005	EXAMINER	
W. EDWARD RAMAGE COMMERCE CENTER SUITE 1000 211 COMMERCE ST NASHVILLE, TN 37201			PREBILIC, PAUL B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3738	

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/706,630

Applicant(s)

MCDONALD, MARGUERITE B. ED

Examiner

Paul B. Prebilic

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Objections

Claim 32 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend upon another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Claim 32 is dependent upon multiple dependent claim 30, albeit indirectly, such that it is dependent upon a multiple dependent claim and it is also a multiple dependent claim itself. Accordingly, the claim 32 not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regard to claim 11, "the material" lacks antecedent basis from claim 1.

With regard to claims 12-38, the use of "lens capsule" is confusing because apparently two lens capsules have been set forth in the claims, both the natural lens capsule and an artificial lens capsule. For this reason, it is unclear which of the two are being modified in the claims, particularly the dependent claims.

With regard to claims 12-38, the preamble and claim body are not considered to be commensurate with each other because the preamble calls for a "multifocal intraocular lens", yet the body of claim 12 requires a lens capsule and a substance that are not within the scope of a lens. For this reason, the claim language is considered to

Art Unit: 3738

be indefinite but will be treated as a combination of a lens and the other elements upon evaluation of the merits.

With regard to claim 13, the size claimed is considered to be indefinite because it is based upon an indefinite parameter, the size of the patient. Since the patient size has not been adequately set forth, the claim scope is considered to be indefinite.

With regard to claims 36 and 37, the term "spring-like" is considered to be indefinite because it is not clear what falls within the scope of this claim language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the claimed lens is used in combination with the eye, a naturally occurring component of the body, such that the claimed invention is non-statutory. The Examiner suggested changing "is positioned" to "is adapted to be positioned" in order to overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3738

Claims 1, 2, and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Portney (US 4,898,461). Portney anticipates the claim language where the periphery thereof is outside peaks (54) and (56) (see Figures 4 and 8A), the anterior and posterior surfaces are "substantially elliptical" because "substantially" is a broad term, and the periphery is tapered from the peaks (54, 56) to the edges such that the claim language is read upon by Portney; see the abstract. The lower portion as claimed is the lower half of Portney's lens.

With regard to claim 7, Applicant is directed to see column 6, lines 41-65 and column 7, lines 11-35.

With regard to claim 8, the Examiner asserts that at least one of the zones on the lower half of the lens inherently has a greater index than one of the zones on the upper half of the lens such that the claim language is fully met. This is due to the fact that the same base material is used and the lens is altered to have greater indices in some zones as compared to others.

Claims 1, 5-9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gupta et al (US 5,728, 156). Gupta meets the claim language where the lower portion with semicircular shape as claimed is shown in Figure 4 below the center spot (i.e. the lower half of the lens), the substantially elliptical posterior and anterior portions are shown in Figure 5 where the outer edge of Figure 5 is taken to the same as that shown in Figure 4.

With regard to claims 7 and 8, Applicant is directed to column 6, line 40 to column 8, line 30 where the wedge gives the lower portion a greater index of refraction.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al (US 5,728,156) in view of Grendahl (US 4,778,462). Gupta meets the claim language as explained supra, but fails to disclose a colored or "not colorless" lens as claimed. However, Grendahl teaches that it was known to color different parts of intraocular lenses with different colors for enhanced accommodation; see column 2, lines 15-19. Therefore, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to color the different portions of the Gupta lens system for the same reason that Grendahl does the same.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3 and 4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 12, 13, 16-31, and 33-38 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Art Unit: 3738

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Applicant should specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure, including the claims (MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06). Due to the procedure outlined in MPEP 2163.06 for interpreting claims, it is noted that other art may be applicable under 35 USC 102 or 35 USC 103(a) once the aforementioned issue(s) is/are addressed.

Applicant is respectfully requested to provide a list of all copending applications that set forth similar subject matter to the present claims. A copy of such copending claims is respectfully requested in response to this Office action if the application is not stored in image format (i.e. the IFW system) or published.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Paul B. Prebilic whose telephone number is (571) 272-4758. He can normally be reached on 6:30-5:00 M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, McDermott Corrine can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Paul Prebilic
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3738